

# LORD DEWAR POINTS PROHIBITION EVILS

Too Drastic, Breeds Lawbreakers, Distiller Says in Sailing.

## LIPTON GUESTS DEPART

Shamrock Designer Sees Victory Next Time as Olympic Gets Away.

Prohibition is making the American people a nation of lawbreakers. Lord Dewar, the Scotch distiller, said yesterday just before sailing for England on the White Star liner Olympic.

Lord Dewar and Sir John and Lady Ferguson, who also sailed, came here for the Cup races at Sir Thomas Lipton's guests, and the indefatigable challenger was at the dock to see them off.

Lord Dewar made it plain that he did not oppose regulation of intoxicating beverages, but said he thought the law here was too restrictive for most people.

"I have watched the prohibition and restriction laws as they have been in operation in various countries," he said, "and my belief is that coming here for the first time in fourteen years has shown that the American people have had something passed that is too drastic for the majority. I do not think that regulation of the sale of liquor was quite necessary, but I have not seen that it was necessary here to create a 'bone dry' situation which results in the law being constantly broken."

"In England the hours are now five a day instead of fifteen for the sale of liquor in public places. Alcoholic content has been reduced and the business is in the hands of men of an high standing as are engaged in any trade."

Despite his criticism of the prohibition law, Lord Dewar admitted Americans had some strong points. He said he had "a fine lot of constables," and that, speaking as a former sheriff of London in charge of traffic, our traffic regulations and handling are nearly perfect.

Sir John Ferguson, who is a director of Lloyd's Bank in England, said that the "strange" displayed here astonished him. Lady Ferguson said it was not nearly so warm here as she had expected.

The farewell word of Charles Nicholson, designer of the Shamrock IV, also on the Olympic, was:

"We wished it this time. Next time we'll get it."

William J. Mulligan, Supreme Knight of the Knights of Columbus, said that a party of Knights who go to-day on the Leopoldina to tour France. When the "cases" reach Havre they will be met by Marshall Foch and the President of France or his representative.

Another passenger was Louis J. Reckford, president of the American Lead Pencil Company, who said he is going to England on a business trip and will be back about the middle of September.

Other passengers were Commander V. V. Woodward, U. S. N.; Gladys Rock, an actress; Charles D. Orth, president of the National Security League, and Mrs. Orth; Frederick Toppin, vice-president of the International Mercantile Marine; Charles Steele of J. P. Morgan & Co. and Miss Loraine Goodrich of Milwaukee.

## ASK U. S. NEGROES TO RECLAIM AFRICA

12,000,000 Will Oust Whites, Garvey Tells Convention.

"There is no question but that the whites in Africa want to exterminate the native blacks there," declared Marcus Garvey, president of the Black Star Steamship Line and chairman at a session last night of the Universal Negro Improvement Association in Liberty Hall, 138th street, near Lenox avenue.

"But," he added, "the 12,000,000 negroes in the United States and West Indies are powerful enough to take to the field in defense of their 400,000,000 brethren in Africa and lead them in the fight for the emancipation of Africa for the black man."

"There is no question either that the United States does not want us. It's the best writing on the wall that we should go home, and Africa is our natural home."

Not until the negro is able to write his own "bill of rights" can he live comfortably, and under white man government he cannot do so, Mr. Garvey said. White men had referred to negroes as men but as "missing links," he said, but their behavior in the recent war testified that the negro was truly a man, with heart, courage, sympathy and full understanding.

Speeches in similar vein were made by Prof. W. H. Ferris, editor of the Negro World, and the Rev. Dr. James David Brooks of Virginia. The suggestions to emancipate Africa brought tremendous demonstrations of approval from the 2,000 delegates from all parts of the world who are attending the convention.

The whites brought us over here against our will; make them give us ships to go back in," said the Rev. Dr. Brooks.

The bands of the association and of the Black Star Line gave a joint concert.

## NEW BEDFORD CHIEF FREES GIRL RIOTERS

Mrs. Frank Christian Acts to End Disorders.

When Mrs. Frank Christian of Elmira took charge yesterday of the State Reformatory for Women at Bedford, N. Y., her first move was to release in groups from prison cells fifty prisoners who participated in the riot twelve days ago.

Mrs. Christian made a tour of the prison, where nearly fifty rioters, both black and white, are held in cells. Dr. Menns S. Gregory of Bellevue Hospital, who is another manager of the reformatory, took Mrs. Christian to the new psychiatric ward where Dr. Gregory is treating hysterical delinquents.

There Dorothy Jett, Marie Davis, Lillian Rosenstein and other exorable prisoners were found to be perfectly sane. They have been permitted to leave their cells for exercise in twelve days. Mrs. Christian promised to let them out for daily exercise immediately.

## OWNERS OF GIANTS DENY.

No Interest in Casino in Havana, They Say.

The following letter was received last night from E. T. Brannick, assistant secretary of the National Exhibition Company, owners of the New York Giants:

"I am directed by Mr. Charles A. Stensham and Mr. John J. McGraw to state that they are in no way connected with the Casino in Havana, Cuba. This letter refers to the story in the SUN AND NEW YORK HERALD, August 4, 1920."

# VICE RAID THREAT LAID TO LANDLORD

New Way of Getting Rid of Tenants Is Developed.

## K. C. SAIL TO-DAY ON METZ PILGRIMAGE

Departure on the Leopoldina Marks Close of Annual Convention Here.

## PASS IRISH RESOLUTION

All True Americans Believe Ireland Should Be Independent Nation, It Says.

The departure to-day of the Knights of Columbus delegation on the pilgrimage to Europe aboard the Leopoldina will mark the close of their thirty-eighth annual session convention, which has been in session in the Commodore since Tuesday.

Hundreds of relatives of the pilgrims will board the Highlander at Pier A at 5 o'clock this afternoon and sail down the bay with the Leopoldina.

Election of officers and presentation of reports filled the programme yesterday. By unanimous vote the following were elected to the supreme board of directors: John F. O'Neill, Jersey City; William F. Fox, Indianapolis; Joseph J. Myers, Carroll, Ia.; James J. McGraw, Panama City, Okla.; John A. Dwyer, Toledo, Ohio; Edward A. Houlihan, Chicago; and Frank W. Loneragan, Portland, Ore. David I. Sipple of San Francisco was elected supreme warden.

The board of directors reported that of the \$400,000 war fund entrusted to them more than half had been spent in welfare work in camps. From a balance of \$11,000,000 enough has been set aside to care for the education of 500 veterans, who now are enjoying K. of C. scholarships in universities and colleges, and \$7,000,000 is available for the extension and intensification of night schools.

Before adjournment last evening the convention unanimously adopted this resolution defining their views on Ireland:

"As Americans and as Knights of Columbus we believe in the right of freedom to every people everywhere to determine the form of government under which they live. It is the duty of the K. of C. to say it, but say it we do, that the Knights of Columbus, in common with all true Americans, believe that Ireland has the right and ought to be a free and independent nation. This truth is axiomatic and therefore no argument is necessary."

A letter from Eamon de Valera was received soon after the resolution was passed.

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

# K. C. SAIL TO-DAY ON METZ PILGRIMAGE

Departure on the Leopoldina Marks Close of Annual Convention Here.

## PASS IRISH RESOLUTION

All True Americans Believe Ireland Should Be Independent Nation, It Says.

The departure to-day of the Knights of Columbus delegation on the pilgrimage to Europe aboard the Leopoldina will mark the close of their thirty-eighth annual session convention, which has been in session in the Commodore since Tuesday.

Hundreds of relatives of the pilgrims will board the Highlander at Pier A at 5 o'clock this afternoon and sail down the bay with the Leopoldina.

Election of officers and presentation of reports filled the programme yesterday. By unanimous vote the following were elected to the supreme board of directors: John F. O'Neill, Jersey City; William F. Fox, Indianapolis; Joseph J. Myers, Carroll, Ia.; James J. McGraw, Panama City, Okla.; John A. Dwyer, Toledo, Ohio; Edward A. Houlihan, Chicago; and Frank W. Loneragan, Portland, Ore. David I. Sipple of San Francisco was elected supreme warden.

The board of directors reported that of the \$400,000 war fund entrusted to them more than half had been spent in welfare work in camps. From a balance of \$11,000,000 enough has been set aside to care for the education of 500 veterans, who now are enjoying K. of C. scholarships in universities and colleges, and \$7,000,000 is available for the extension and intensification of night schools.

Before adjournment last evening the convention unanimously adopted this resolution defining their views on Ireland:

"As Americans and as Knights of Columbus we believe in the right of freedom to every people everywhere to determine the form of government under which they live. It is the duty of the K. of C. to say it, but say it we do, that the Knights of Columbus, in common with all true Americans, believe that Ireland has the right and ought to be a free and independent nation. This truth is axiomatic and therefore no argument is necessary."

A letter from Eamon de Valera was received soon after the resolution was passed.

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

# \$1,000,000 DAMAGES ASKED IN RYAN SUIT

Stock Exchange President and Five Members of Governing Board Are Named.

## RESULT OF STUTZ CASE

Head of Motor Company Charges Conspiracy to Evade Obligations in Stock Sale.

Allan A. Ryan sued the New York Stock Exchange yesterday for \$1,000,000 damages in an action brought in Supreme Court.

This suit is the one he announced would result in due time from the action of the governing committee of the exchange on March 31 last in striking Stutz Motor Car Company stock from the exchange list quotations.

The committee acted after a sensational situation had arisen by reason of the fact that members of the exchange asserted traders in the market were "short" of this stock.

Ryan has named William H. Remick, president of the New York Stock Exchange, and the following members of the governing committee as defendants: Herbert T. B. Jacquelin, Donald C. Giddens, Howard F. Whitney, Arthur Turnbull and Henry G. S. Noble. He charges a conspiracy on their part to permit members to evade their obligations in the sale of Stutz stock.

The board of directors reported that of the \$400,000 war fund entrusted to them more than half had been spent in welfare work in camps. From a balance of \$11,000,000 enough has been set aside to care for the education of 500 veterans, who now are enjoying K. of C. scholarships in universities and colleges, and \$7,000,000 is available for the extension and intensification of night schools.

Before adjournment last evening the convention unanimously adopted this resolution defining their views on Ireland:

"As Americans and as Knights of Columbus we believe in the right of freedom to every people everywhere to determine the form of government under which they live. It is the duty of the K. of C. to say it, but say it we do, that the Knights of Columbus, in common with all true Americans, believe that Ireland has the right and ought to be a free and independent nation. This truth is axiomatic and therefore no argument is necessary."

A letter from Eamon de Valera was received soon after the resolution was passed.

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."


The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."

"It is shown that the board, as such, neither authorized nor directed the actions of the defendant which are complained of, but that members of the board did these things. There make public protest against the Mayor's act and dissent from what he was doing so far as it might seem that he was acting or speaking for the board. It was not the board that acted; there was no question before it, and it was in no way involved."

The Justice found that the Mayor cannot take away a privilege granted by the board, and in the instance in question that the Mayor acted against the protest of the board.

"If the Mayor had a personal difference with the board," said Justice Fawcett, "or if he took affront at what the board wrote about the meeting of the board, it did not lie with him to deny the plaintiff's representative a privilege granted to all the members of the press by the board."



## Your Office Problem Solved

In The New 31 Story, Mortgage-Free, Park-Madison Building  
46th to 47th St.—Madison to Park Ave.

### OFFICE SPACE

**\$1.68 to \$2.24**  
PER SQUARE FOOT

SINGLE FLOOR UNITS OF 10,000 to 60,000 Sq. Ft.

Now being offered for sale to subscribers at a price which, after charging 6% interest on the investment and 2% for amortization, will cost them \$1.68 to \$2.24 per sq. ft. until the investment is amortized. No rent charge thereafter.

In purchasing space on the Park-Madison Co-operative Ownership Plan, subscribers are protected by every safeguard. The building will be free and clear of mortgage, and its completion guaranteed by a Surety Company Bond.

An amount of space will be reserved for renting, the estimated revenue from which will pay all operating costs and leave a surplus.

The Park-Madison Building will be owned, and